



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,669	08/19/2003	John D. Tanner	9346	5756

27752 7590 03/15/2006

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER

KIM, YOON YOUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1723

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/643,669

Applicant(s)

TANNER ET AL.

Examiner

Yoon-Young Kim

Art Unit

1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 37-50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/10/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-36, drawn to a water filter device, classified in class 210, subclass 110.
 - II. Claims 37-43, drawn to a method of treating low-pressure untreated drinking water, classified in class 210, subclass 767.
 - III. Claims 44-50, drawn to a method of incorporating a modular water filter device, classified in class 210, subclass 282.

2. The inventions are independent or distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus such as an electric water filter device.

Inventions III and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus such as a device without a connector.

Art Unit: 1723

Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination of Invention III has separate utility such as in a process without a connector. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Restriction for examination purposes is proper because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and also because (i) they have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, (ii) the search required for the respective groups is not necessarily required by each of the other groups, and (iii) their subject matter is recognized as divergent.

3. During a telephone conversation with Richard Alexander on February 27, 2006 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of the water filter device, Claims 1-36. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 37-50 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1, 5-7, 19, 21-22, 29, and 31 are objected to because of the following informalities: abbreviations F-VLR and F-BLR should be fully written out. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 12-14, 16-17, 19-22, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clack, U.S. Patent No. 4,997,553 in view of Birdsong et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,131,277 and Koslow, U.S. Patent No. 6,630,016 B2.

Regarding Claim 1, Clack discloses a water filter device for treating untreated drinking water, the water filter device comprising: a connector (#28) for providing fluid communication between the water filter device and an untreated drinking water source (#12); a low-pressure water filter (#20) in fluid communication with the connector, a storage housing (#24) in fluid communication with the low-pressure water filter; an automatic shutoff valve (#18) in fluid communication with the storage housing; and a dispenser (#26) in fluid communication with the storage housing. However, Clack does not disclose the F-BLR of the water filter or the water flow rate. Koslow teaches a water filter with an F-BLR of greater than about 2 logs (Tables I

Art Unit: 1723

and II). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum F-BLR. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Birdsong teaches a water filter with a flow rate of 40 to 300 mL/min (Col. 22, Line 67- Col. 23, Line 2). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum flow rate. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding Claim 2, Koslow discloses that the filter material comprises mesoporous activated carbon filter particles (Col. 2, Lines 1-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in modify Clack with the element of Koslow in order to make a filter medium having enhanced microbiological interception capability (Col. 2, Lines 9-14).

Regarding Claim 3, Koslow discloses that the filter material comprises mesoporous and basic activated carbon filter particles (Col. 2, Lines 1-14; Col. 4, Lines 53-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack with the element of Koslow in order to provide enhanced electro-kinetic interception of microorganisms (Col. 4, Lines 53-58).

Regarding Claims 5-7, Koslow discloses a water filter with a F-BLR of greater than about 4 logs and a F-VLR of greater than about 3 logs (Tables I and II). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum F-BLR. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding Claim 12, Birdsong discloses that at least a portion of the filter vessel (#11) is oriented on a front or side portion of said water filter device (Fig. 1). It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 1723

to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack with the element of Birdsong because they are both water filter devices and in order to be able to house the filter media.

Regarding Claim 13, Birdsong discloses that the height of the filter vessel (#14) is less than about 75% the height of the water filter device (Fig. 1). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum height. It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to make the filter vessel height as so desired or required, including as claimed to optimize filtration.

Regarding Claim 14, Clack discloses that the storage housing may be separably removed from the filter device (#136).

Regarding Claim 16, Birdsong discloses a means of indicating the life of the water filter (Col. 20, Lines 4-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack with the element of Birdsong in order to be able inform the user that the filter requires replacement (Col. 20, Lines 4-18).

Regarding Claim 17, Birdsong discloses a pre-filter consisting of polypropylene (Col. 5, Lines 2-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack with the element of Birdsong in order to be able to remove dirt particles (Col. 5, Lines 26-27).

Regarding Claim 19, Clack discloses a water filter device for treating untreated drinking water, the water filter device comprising: a connector (#28) for providing fluid communication between the water filter device and an untreated drinking water source (#12); a low-pressure water filter (#20) in fluid communication with the connector, a storage housing (#24) in fluid communication with the low-pressure water filter; an automatic shutoff valve (#18) in fluid communication with the storage housing; and a dispenser (#26) in fluid communication with the storage housing. However, Clack does not disclose the F-BLR of the water filter, a filter vessel, or the water flow rate. Koslow teaches a water filter with an F-BLR of greater than about 2 logs

Art Unit: 1723

(Tables I and II). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum F-BLR. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Birdsong teaches a water filter with a filter vessel (#11) and a flow rate of 40 to 300 mL/min (Col. 22, Line 67- Col. 23, Line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack with the element of Birdsong in order to be able to house the filter media. Furthermore, one of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum flow rate. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding Claim 20, Koslow discloses that the filter material comprises mesoporous and basic activated carbon filter particles (Col. 2, Lines 1-14; Col. 4, Lines 53-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack with the element of Koslow in order to provide enhanced electro-kinetic interception of microorganisms (Col. 4, Lines 53-58).

Regarding Claims 21-22, Koslow discloses a water filter with a F-BLR of greater than about 4 logs and a F-VLR of greater than about 3 logs (Tables I and II). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum F-BLR. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding Claim 26, Clack discloses that the storage housing may be separably removed from the filter device (#136).

Regarding Claim 27, Birdsong discloses a pre-filter consisting of polypropylene (Col. 5, Lines 2-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack with the element of Birdsong in order to be able to remove dirt particles (Col. 5, Lines 26-27).

Art Unit: 1723

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Sipos et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,371,221.

Regarding Claim 4, Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong does not disclose reduced-oxygen activated carbon particles. Sipos teaches reduced-oxygen activated carbon particles (Col. 2, Lines 7-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong with the element of Sipos in order to reduce the overall heat input needed to preheat the carbon evenly (Col. 2, Lines 43-46).

9. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Baerg et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,670,892.

Regarding Claim 8, Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong does not disclose a float. Baerg teaches a water filter device wherein the shutoff valve comprises a float (Col. 5, Lines 49-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong with the element of Baerg in order to be able to turn off the flow at a predetermined water height (Col. 5, Lines 49-54).

10. Claims 9-10 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong as applied to Claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Deines et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,147,631 and Renn, U.S. Patent No. 3,268,444.

Regarding Claims 9-10 and 24, Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong does not disclose a flow regulator or fluid contact time or pressure. Deines teaches a water filter device comprising a flow regulator (#145) with an incoming water pressure of between 30 and 40 psi

Art Unit: 1723

(Col. 5, Lines 29-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Birdsong with the element of Deines in order to be able to set a limit on the flow rate (Col. 5, Lines 34-39). Renn teaches a water filter device with a fluid contact time of 15 seconds (Col. 2, Lines 30-34). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum fluid contact time. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

11. Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong as applied to Claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Deines and Scavuzzo et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,333,703.

Regarding Claims 11 and 25, Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong does not disclose a threadably attachable filter vessel or a torque. Deines teaches a water filter device comprising a threadably attachable filter vessel (#14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong with the element of Deines in order to be able to removably secure the filter to the base (Col. 3, Lines 29-34). Scavuzzo teaches a filter comprising a threaded casing with cover that can be installed with a torque of about 4 to 5 ft.-lbs. (Col. 6, Lines 19-25). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum torque. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Art Unit: 1723

12. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Kuh et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,681,677.

Regarding Claim 15, Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong does not disclose a window. Kuh teaches a water filter device comprising a window (#45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong with the element of Kuh in order to be able to view the water meter unit (Col. 4, Line 64 – Col. 5, Line 4).

13. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Cranshaw et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,117,319.

Regarding Claim 18, Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong does not disclose the volume of the storage housing. Cranshaw teaches a water filter device comprising a storage housing having a volume of between 500 mL to 3 liters (Col. 4, Lines 1-2). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum volume. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

14. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong as applied to Claim 19 above, and further in view of Coates et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,707,518.

Regarding Claim 23, Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong does not disclose radial flow. Coates teaches a water filter device wherein the untreated drinking water radially enters and radially flows through the water filter material (Col. 5, Lines 43-48). It would have been obvious

Art Unit: 1723

to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong with the element of Coates because they are both carbon water filters.

15. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong as applied to Claim 19 above, and further in view of Wadsworth et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,123,837.

Regarding Claim 28, Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong does not disclose a button. Wadsworth teaches a filter device comprising a filter release button (#90). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack in view of Koslow and Birdsong with the element of Wadsworth in order to provide a simple and efficient engagement and release means (Col. 2, Lines 44-50).

16. Claims 29-31 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clack in view of Koslow, Birdsong, Deines, and Renn.

Regarding Claim 29, Clack discloses a water filter device for treating untreated drinking water, the water filter device comprising: a connector (#28) for providing fluid communication between the water filter device and an untreated drinking water source (#12); a low-pressure water filter (#20) in fluid communication with the connector, a storage housing (#24) in fluid communication with the low-pressure water filter; an automatic shutoff valve (#18) in fluid communication with the storage housing; and a dispenser (#26) in fluid communication with the storage housing. However, Clack does not disclose the F-BLR of the water filter, a filter vessel, water flow rate, flow regulator, fluid contact time, or pressure. Koslow teaches a water filter with an F-BLR of greater than about 2 logs (Tables I and II). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum F-BLR. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or

Art Unit: 1723

workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Birdsong teaches a water filter with a filter vessel (#11) and a flow rate of 40 to 300 mL/min (Col. 22, Line 67- Col. 23, Line 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack with the element of Birdsong in order to be able to house the filter media. Furthermore, one of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum flow rate. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Deines teaches a water filter device comprising a flow regulator (#145) with an incoming water pressure of between 30 and 40 psi (Col. 5, Lines 29-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Birdsong with the element of Deines in order to be able to set a limit on the flow rate (Col. 5, Lines 34-39). Renn teaches a water filter device with a fluid contact time of 15 seconds (Col. 2, Lines 30-34). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum fluid contact time. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding Claim 30, Koslow discloses that the filter material comprises mesoporous and basic activated carbon filter particles (Col. 2, Lines 1-14; Col. 4, Lines 53-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack with the element of Koslow in order to provide enhanced electro-kinetic interception of microorganisms (Col. 4, Lines 53-58).

Regarding Claim 31, Koslow discloses a water filter with a F-BLR of greater than about 4 logs and a F-VLR of greater than about 3 logs (Tables I and II). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum F-BLR. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or

Art Unit: 1723

workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding Claim 35, Clack discloses that the storage housing may be separably removed from the filter device (#136).

Regarding Claim 36, Birdsong discloses a pre-filter consisting of polypropylene (Col. 5, Lines 2-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack with the element of Birdsong in order to be able to remove dirt particles (Col. 5, Lines 26-27).

17. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clack in view of Koslow, Birdsong, Deines, and Renn as applied to Claim 29 above, and further in view of Scavuzzo.

Regarding Claim 33, Clack in view of Koslow, Birdsong, Deines, and Renn does not disclose a torque. Scavuzzo teaches a filter comprising a threaded casing with cover that can be installed with a torque of about 4 to 5 ft.-lbs. (Col. 6, Lines 19-25). One of skill in the art would by routine experimentation find the optimum torque. It is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

18. Claims 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clack in view of Koslow, Birdsong, Deines, and Renn as applied to Claim 29 above, and further in view of Coates.

Regarding Claim 32, Clack in view of Koslow, Birdsong, Deines, and Renn does not disclose a wall-mount bracket. Coates teaches a water filter device comprising a wall-mount bracket (#52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack in

Art Unit: 1723

view of Koslow, Birdsong, Deines, and Renn with the element of Coates because it is a means of mechanical attachment common in the filter art.

Regarding Claim 34, Clack in view of Koslow, Birdsong, Deines, and Renn does not disclose radial flow. Coates teaches a water filter device wherein the untreated drinking water radially enters and radially flows through the water filter material (Col. 5, Lines 43-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Clack in view of Koslow, Birdsong, Deines, and Renn with the element of Coates because they are both carbon water filters.

Conclusion

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yoon-Young Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-2240. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30, Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker can be reached on (571) 272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

YK
03/03/06


JOHN KIM
Primary PATENT EXAMINER